

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING D	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/741,048	12/21/2	000	Yoshihiro Yamaguchi	0879-0295P	5515	
2292	7590	02/08/2005		EXAMINER		
		ASCH & BIRG	CH	HERNANDEZ, NELSON D		
PO BOX 74' FALLS CHU	7 JRCH, VA 22	040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			2612		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	0.00 A // 0	09/741,048	YAMAGUCHI, YOSHIHIRO	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		. Nelson D. Hernandez	2612	
Period fo	 The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply 	tion appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	<u> </u>
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA naions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute the toreply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. FOR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir pry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON. by statute. cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. INDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)	
Status				
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <u>15 October 2004</u> .		
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b)	☐ This action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice			
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)	Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrictio	withdrawn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the E The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 20 Applicant may not request that any objectio Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	000 is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar e correction is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International see the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in A he priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachmen	t(s)			
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)	
3) 🔯 Infom	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO r No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/19/04 & 11/19/04</u> .	948) Paper No(s D/SB/08) 5) Notice of Ir 6) Other:)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/741,048 Page 2

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on October 15, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited portion of the Belucci fails to disclose an operation in which the size of a person area in an image is compared with a predetermined size and the size of the image is changed so that the size of the person area is the predetermined size. Examiner respectfully disagrees, Belucci teaches separating the subject area from the background area and resizing the size of the image separated of said subject so as to fit the area required for the photo of the ID card (Col. 5, lines 15-49). When resizing the image so as to fit the area required for the photo of the ID card, Belucci inherently discloses that the image is being compared to the size of the image area required for the ID card.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims **1-6**, **8** and **9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa, Patent 5,296,945 in view of Belucci, Patent 5,913,542 B1.

Application/Control Number

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding **claim 1**, Nishikawa discloses an identification photo system (Fig. 2) that obtains image data for an identification photo of a person (Fig. 2: 22) from image data of the person, said identification photo system comprising an automatic correcting device (Fig. 2) that automatically corrects the image data of the person (Col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 13; col. 6, lines 40-56; col. 9, lines 42-65). Nishikawa does not explicitly teach that the automatic correcting device detects a person area in said image data, compares the size of the person area in said image data with a predetermined size, and changes the size of the image so that the size of the person area is the predetermined size.

However, Belucci teaches a system for producing ID cards wherein the system separates the image area from the background area from the subject area (Doing so inherently teaches detecting the person area) so as to compress the image data for the identification card (Col. 4, lines 8-19), as part of the compression algorithm, the background is changed to a predetermined color (normalized or eliminated), also teaches resizing the size of the image separated of said subject so as to fit the area required for the photo of the ID card (Col. 5, lines 15-49). When resizing the image so as to fit the area required for the photo of the ID card, Belucci inherently discloses that the image is being compared to the size of the image area required for the ID card.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Nishikawa in view of Belucci as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the identification photo system by having means to separate a person area and a background area and a background color-changing

Art Unit: 2612

means to change the color of the background to a predetermined color and by including means for changing the size of a photo to a predetermined size. The motivation to do so would help the identification photo system to compress the image of the person only since the background is not that relevant and can be changed and to adjust the size of the image of the person so as to fit the area required for the photo as suggested by Belucci (Col. 4, lines 8-19).

Regarding **claim 2**, Nishikawa discloses that the automatic correcting device corrects at least one of density, color balance, luminance and saturation of an image of the person (Col. 5, lines 56-65; col. 6, lines 47-66).

Regarding **claim 3**, Nishikawa discloses that the automatic correcting device comprises: a skin pigmentation area abstracting device (detection point setting unit in fig. 2: 52) that abstracts a skin pigmentation area from the image; a skin pigmentation correction value calculating device (comparator in fig. 2: 58) that calculates skin pigmentation correction values according to colors of the skin pigmentation area abstracted by said skin pigmentation area abstracting device and a predetermined skin pigmentation correction target value (stored in standard color memory in fig. 2: 56); and a color correcting device (look-up table in fig. 2: 60) that corrects the colors of the skin pigmentation area according to the skin pigmentation correction values calculated by said skin pigmentation correction value calculating device (the look-up table is used to correct the colors based on the result of the comparator) (Col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 13; col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 7).

Application/Control Number: 09/741,048

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding **claim 4**, Nishikawa substantially discloses the same in claim 3.

Therefore, grounds for rejecting claim 3 apply here. Furthermore, Nishikawa teaches performing a complexion conversion the colors of the image stored in memory (Fig. 2: 30) according to a preferable complexion (Col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 7).

Regarding **claim 5**, the combination of Nishikawa in view of Belucci teaches a system for producing ID cards wherein the system separates the image area from the background area so as to compress the image data for the identification card (Belucci, Col. 4, lines 8-19), as part of the compression algorithm, the background is changed to a predetermined color (normalized or eliminated), also teaches that a software automatically resize the images so as to fit the required area for the photo (Belucci, Col. 5, lines 15-49).

Regarding **claim 6**, the combination of Nishikawa in view of Belucci teaches an abstracting device that abstracts a print area required for the identification photo from the image according to the size of the image by teaching the software automatically resize the images to a predetermined size so as to fit the area required area for the photo (Col. 5, lines 15-49).

Regarding **claim 8**, Nishikawa discloses the identification photo system comprising a printer (Fig. 2: 34) that prints the identification photo from the image data for the identification photo (Col. 3, lines 43-51).

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Nishikawa in view of Belucci teaches an apparatus performing the same as in claim 1 and 3. Therefore, grounds for rejecting claim 1 and 3 apply here.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa, Patent 5,296,945 in view of Belucci, Patent 5,913,542 B1 and further in view of O'Brill, Patent 5,937,081.

Page 6

Re claim 7, the combination of Nishikawa in view of Belucci fails to teach a cloth area abstracting device that abstracts a cloth area from the image; and a cloth-changing device that changes image data of the cloth area to image data of predetermined cloth.

However, O'Brill teaches an image composition system wherein a camera takes an image of a person (Fig. 1: 12) and the composition system separates the image of the person's head from the body and the background (See flow chart in fig. 6) so as to change the person's clothes (i.e. shirt and pants) according to the body type of said person (Col. 5, line 49 - col. 6, line 47).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Nishikawa in view of Belucci and further in view of O'Brill as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate in Nishikawa with a cloth changing system to abstract the part of the body related to the cloth's area or the body form the person so as to change the clothes of the person to predetermined clothes, with the motivation of avoiding having to require a person to have a specific type of clothes to be photograph with the system, facilitating the system to combine the subject with different accessory items as suggested by O'Brill (Col. 1, lines 56-61).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (703) 305-8717, [(571) 272-7311 after February 28, 2005]. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy R. Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929, [(571) 272-7308 after February 28, 2005]. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nelson D. Hernandez Examiner Art Unit 2612

NDHH February 4, 2005

WENDY REAMBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
2600